

## **REMARKS**

This RCE is responsive to the final Office Action dated October 17, 2003 in which the Examiner rejects all the pending claims 1- 20 as either being anticipated by Utsu (US Patent No. 5,343,172) under 35 USC §102(b) or as being obvious over Utsu, or further in view of Kleveland (WO 98/47190) under 35 USC §103(a). Applicant has further amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15 to more clearly define the present invention, and respectfully traverses the rejections based on the amended claims and the following detailed explanation.

In particular, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15 to define the distinguishing features of the present invention in clearer claim language so as to avoid any unambiguity, thus clearly distinguishing the present invention from the disclosures of the cited prior art. More specifically, the distinguishing feature that “the entire impedance transformer network, solely by which the predetermined impedance of the signal is synthesized at the input of the power amplifier, is joined in parallel with the source” is believed not disclosed or implied in the cited Utsu et al (US Patent No. 5,343,172), Kleveland (WO 98/47190) or their combination.

In Utsu, the input matching circuit (read as the “impedance transformer network” in the present application) comprises a series reactance and a parallel variable reactance circuit. However, throughout Utsu, only the parallel variable reactance circuit, but not the entire matching circuit, is joined in parallel with the source. In addition, it is noted that the source input impedance is synthesized at the input of the power amplifier not solely by the parallel variable reactance circuit, and thus the parallel variable reactance circuit should not be read as the impedance transformer network. Therefore, amended independent claims 1, 10 and 15 are believed not anticipated by Utsu. Moreover, the above distinguishing features cannot be found in Kleveland (WO 98/47190) either. Therefore, independent claims 1, 10 and 15 are believed patentable under both 35USC §102 and §103.

At least for the same reasons, dependent claims 2-9, 11-14 and 16-20 are also believed


patentable, as each of them includes all the limitations of one of the dependent claims 1, 10 and 15.

The applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance in view of the amendment to the claims and above remarks. The Examiner is authorized to deduct additional fees believed due from our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,

KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.  
900 Route 9 North  
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095  
Telephone (732) 634-7634

Dated: January 12, 2004



Jeffrey I. Kaplan  
(Reg. No. 34,356)

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail, in a postage prepaid envelope, addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on January 12, 2004.

Dated January 12, 2004 Signed Fern Pekarofski Print Name Fern Pekarofski